

February 23, 1967

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S2463

the citizen, not to mention the police, will need more effective tools than the President seems willing to give him.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 21, 1967]

#### CONFESSED KILLER OF SIX IS SET FREE

New York, February 20.—A murder indictment was dismissed today because the confessed killer—charged with six murders—was not briefed on his rights before he confessed.

The indictment against Jose Suarez, 23, was dismissed "reluctantly" by Brooklyn Supreme Court Justice Michael Kern, who added: "It makes one's blood run cold and it makes any human being's stomach turn to let a thing like this out on the street."

Suarez was accused of fatally stabbing his common-law wife, Maria Torres, 24, and five children ranging from 11 months to 6 years in age. Suarez was said to be the father of three of the children.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE ALARMING TREND TOWARD POLICE-STATE TACTICS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I think there is cause to be deeply disturbed by a number of developments recently which seem to indicate an alarming trend in this country toward the use of police-state tactics.

I refer to the following developments:

First. The lavish subsidization of the National Student Association and other private domestic organizations by the Central Intelligence Agency.

Second. The widespread use of wiretapping and eavesdropping by Government agencies.

Third. The subsidization of supposedly legitimate books by the U.S. Information Agency, primarily for propaganda purposes.

Fourth. The use of private detective agencies by large corporations such as General Motors to harass a private citizen such as Ralph Nader.

Fifth. The widespread practice of industrial spying to discover competitor's corporate secrets.

Sixth. The use of a private detective agency by the State of Florida, allegedly to conduct a widespread investigation into crime and corruption.

All of these developments have provoked considerable publicity, and most of them have been criticized in one way or another. When we view all of these developments and others like them as a developing trend or pattern in our society, I think we have reason to be gravely concerned as to whether the United States of America, perhaps unwillingly and unwittingly, is veering away from its traditional role as a free society and drifting toward a passive acceptance of the repulsive practice of a police state.

All of these disturbing developments have certain things in common.

In the first place, all have been carried out under a cloak of secrecy. That alone raises grave questions of public policy. Although there might be a few selected instances where secrecy can be justified by Government agencies or by giant corporations dealing with public questions, as a general rule secrecy is inevitably contrary to the public interest and a step toward corruption and tyranny.

Even more important than their common cloak of secrecy, all of these six activities have involved an element of dishonesty.

When our world-famed intelligence service took over the largest student organization in America, it was not merely an act of secrecy. It was an act of out and out dishonesty. Time after time our Government has denied Communist charges that American students abroad were being used as spies. Now it appears possible or even probable that these statements issued by our Government by students themselves and even their parents were lies. Note that the CIA urged the NSA to deny it was subsidized—in other words, to state that Ramparts magazine, rather than the NSA or the CIA, was lying about this secret arrangement. This was a clearly dishonest arrangement.

When Federal agencies tap telephones and bug hotel rooms, they are not merely acting in secret—they are acting dishonestly. For the law, Government regulations, and the comments of high Government officials have all reassured us that these things were not being done. These assurances, it now appears, were lies.

The subsidizing of books by the U.S. Government is more than an act of secrecy. It is an act of dishonesty, for anyone buying such a book without knowing that it is paid, Government propaganda, is being cruelly deceived.

In the Ralph Nader case, neither General Motors nor the private detective which it hired, Vincent Gillen, seemed to understand that one of the most loathsome aspects of this case was its dishonesty—not just its secrecy.

Detective Gillen lied repeatedly in conducting his investigation; he lied about his name, he lied about his purpose, and he lied about his sponsors. Gillen now tells us that General Motors also lied in saying that the purpose was to find out if Nader was behind lawsuits involving Corvair automobiles. Documentary evidence plus Gillen's own testimony now indicate that dishonesty prevailed throughout this sordid case.

Now the same secret, reprehensible tactics are being employed on a grand scale in the State of Florida. The newly elected Governor has engaged a close personal friend, George R. Wackenhut, and directed him to unleash his detective agency throughout Florida in search of "corrupt officials."

The Wackenhut Corp. has 5,000 employees in 28 offices stretching from Puerto Rico to Hawaii, with subsidiaries in several Latin American countries. Mr. Wackenhut, himself, is deeply involved in politics, both National and at the State level. His firm reportedly does \$23 million a year in business. In 1955

Dade County circuit court and fined \$100 for intimidating a witness. In this case, Wackenhut reportedly lied in telling the witness that Wackenhut had secretly recorded a conversation with the witness through use of a concealed dictaphone. Wackenhut's board of directors include members of the John Birch Society and a number of persons active in national political organizations.

According to the Washington Post, Wackenhut's firm is paid \$3 million a year by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Now this gigantic organization, with its tentacles involved in politics and other affairs over much of the globe, has gone to work for a high public official. Presumably it will have access to all manner of official documents, police files, FBI files and other material generally available only to responsible public officials.

I have said that all of these deplorable developments have in common the elements of secrecy and dishonesty. Yet they have in common something even worse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the worst thing about all of these practices is that the main victims are our own citizens and in many cases these victims are citizens completely innocent of any wrongdoing. Furthermore, these innocent American citizens in many cases will find themselves completely unable to make a satisfactory defense against these secret, police-state tactics.

That is what makes these practices so un-American, and that is why they should not be tolerated by the American people.

I think that American citizens generally are shocked by such tactics, but let me address myself for a moment to those who may not be so shocked.

After all, the Central Intelligence Agency is designed to protect us against communism and, since we all know Communists use ruthless tactics, why cannot we use similar tactics to defend ourselves? Government agencies which tap telephones and bug bedrooms are really fighting crime so what is wrong with that? Books subsidized by the U.S. Information Agency can be a powerful antidote to Communist propaganda, so why cannot we tell our story in the same way the Communists tell theirs? Ralph Nader spent a lot of time getting the goods on General Motors, so why cannot General Motors hire detectives to get the goods on Ralph Nader? The Governor of Florida cannot eliminate crime with the limited police and special investigators available to him. So what is wrong with hiring a good, free enterprise corporation to help accomplish a job that needs doing?

In my opinion, these are questions which clearly answer themselves. But for the benefit of those who, I am sure, raise them in all sincerity let me cite some of the answers.

The most important answer which applies to this is:

S2464

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 23, 1967

"We cannot conquer communism or crime by adopting Communist or criminal tactics."

Also, it must be remembered, in every one of these cases, as I have said, the probable victims are not Communists and criminals, but innocent citizens. The whole purpose of the U.S. Constitution and its world-famed Bill of Rights is to protect innocent citizens from arbitrary tactics by the agencies of government. If a citizen does commit a crime, specific constitutional procedures are spelled out under which the charges must be documented and filed against him and he must have an opportunity to confront his witnesses and defend himself in a court of law. The Constitution specifically forbids that any citizen be deprived of his constitutional rights without due process of law.

Wiretaps and microphones hidden behind family portraits or in a martini olive are not a part of what the Constitution means when it talks of "due process of law." In fact, these are tactics which are used to get around due process.

Since the Constitution says you cannot make a man testify against himself, government and private detective agencies try to secretly record his conversations with his wife, his children, his neighbors, and his business associates to get information which they can use against him and which they cannot obtain in a constitutional manner.

Wiretaps and bugs have not yet been invented which will record only the conversations of the guilty. They record far more conversations of the innocent. Yet even the most innocent conversation, placed in the hands of government agencies or private detectives, can be used to destroy the reputation and the economic standing of almost any citizen in this Nation.

When the Central Intelligence Agency moved in on the National Student Association with its bulging suitcase filled with taxpayers' dollars, it was not damaging international communism—it was damaging an important American institution—a free association of college students. Without the knowledge of most of the students themselves, the CIA transformed this free student association into a Government-operated spy nest and destroyed the value of almost everything these idealistic students strove to accomplish over a 15-year period.

The only basis for holding our young people up as examples to the world is the fact that they are free. They are not the paid stooges of the Government as many Communist students are. By infiltrating the National Student Association with CIA agents and taxpayers' dollars, we have undermined the most important thing that our students stood for. The next time our students cite their all-important American freedom, they will receive smirks from the other side of the aisle.

You cannot adequately judge the evil of any of these practices I have cited if you think of how they affect only Communists and criminals. One must consider first of all how they affect innocent American citizens, how they tarnish the American ideal, how they destroy the

free society of our ancestors so valiantly fought to create.

Secret slush funds such as the CIA used, wiretapping devices such as Government agencies use, secretly subsidized American books and cloak-and-dagger private detective agencies are not subject to the checks and balances so cherished by free American citizens.

If you should be one of those who think it all right for the CIA to finance the NSA, then what conceivable check would you provide on such activity? Would you allow an individual agent to pass out \$400,000 a year to such an association in any way he saw fit? Could he bestow such funds on his friends within the organization? Could he use them conceivably for immoral purposes? Since we did not know that this was being done in the first place, how would we know that the amount of money poured into this sordid scheme was a wise investment? In other words, what kind of budget review could a free society carry out on this secret operation? We have already read how CIA money was used to finance a ludicrous book-selling operation run by a group of high living, naive young businessmen.

Police officers are subjected to strict rules and regulations. Many of them serve heroically for a lifetime at low pay, even in the face of great danger. They live in a goldfish bowl because society holds them too high standards of conduct. What standards do we apply to private detectives and secret agents who are now padding about the country, financed by taxpayers' dollars, subjected to none of the rules and regulations applied to policemen, with virtually no budget review as to how they spend the taxpayers' money, free to operate in almost any way it suits their purpose and the purposes of their farflung clients?

I think it is worthwhile considering for a moment what happened in Germany.

After World War I, Germany was a defeated nation suffering from severe economic problems and political disunity which bordered on anarchy. The problems of the nation were so great and the morale of its people was so low that they put themselves into the hands of a dictator who promised to correct the greatest problems. By crusading against what he described as corrupt and sinister minority forces—primarily communism and members of the Jewish faith—he managed to unite much of the nation. By constructing a mighty war machine he managed to put the German factory and workers back to work again. So the great concerns of the German public appeared to have been met. Yet he did this at a terrible cost. He instituted police-state terrorism. He abolished the constitutional guarantees such as we have in our Constitution and Bill of Rights. He developed propaganda into an art form. In his case too, the intelligence service, the wiretapping, the propaganda publications and the cloak and dagger investigations were aimed at Communists and criminals—at least as he defined them.

The United States of 1967 is by no

mean to exaggerate. But if the people of America tolerate the intrusions of the CIA into free domestic institutions such as the National Student Association, if they tolerate indiscriminate wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping by Government agencies, if they allow their taxes to be spent to corrupt authors and subsidize what appear to be legitimate books, if they allow private detectives to silence those who would criticize our society, we will have gone a long way toward embracing the police-state psychology which gripped Germany following World War I and sowed the seeds of disaster.

It is not enough to say that "it could not happen here." These recent developments have shown that it can—without our knowing it. It may be that the last several Presidents and a few selected congressional leaders were aware that the National Student Association was a front for our international, secret intelligence operation. But most Congressmen and Senators were unaware of it; certainly the press was not aware of it nor was the public and, therefore, this secret intelligence service was in a position where it could have done grave harm to American democracy without our even knowing it.

It may be that the last few Presidents and a few key Government officials are aware that Federal agencies are tapping telephones, bugging offices and homes, but Secretary of the Treasury Dillon assured Senator Long of Missouri on July 13, 1965, that wiretapping was absolutely banned by the Internal Revenue Service. To his embarrassment, the Secretary's own counsel informed him that the IRS was tapping public telephones in the IRS building in Washington. It was revealed later that the Internal Revenue Service and the Treasury Department had been conducting a course for agents in the art of electronic snooping.

The president of General Motors has assured us that he did not know that his firm had hired Vincent Gillen to probe into every aspect of the personal life of Ralph Nader in an obvious attempt to silence him. I am sure we will soon hear of something done by the Wackenhut Corp. of which the Governor of Florida was blissfully unaware.

What this shows is that democratic institutions cannot control police-state tactics once they are set in motion. If secret agents are given millions of dollars to dispense in secret, if investigators are allowed to break into homes and install eavesdropping devices, then the people given these special, secret powers become a kind of new government all their own. That is why the secret police in Germany and Russia become so powerful, once they were allowed to do things which were outside the law and forbidden to other agencies. Once they acquired these powers and gathered their secret information, they became a law unto themselves.

Once we embark upon the use of police-state tactics, even if we pretend to test that we are using these tactics only on Communists and criminals, we take a long step away from democratic self-

February 23, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S2465

I think the time has come to call a halt. I think that the President of the United States, the Congress, the Federal agencies, State and local government and large corporations which carry heavy public responsibility should all pledge themselves to abstain from such practices in the future.

I do think the Congress should inquire into this whole sordid business and find out just how widespread and just how vicious it has become. I think that kind of catharsis would be helpful. But I am primarily concerned about the future. Even if we cannot purge ourselves of all that has happened before, we should make a clear, firm promise that these things will not be done again. If government and the public does not insist upon such a promise, I fear for the future of democracy in these United States.

Wiretapping by Government should certainly be limited to cases involving national security.

All private bugging should be outlawed with stiff penalties.

The CIA's jurisdiction and method of supervision should be overhauled.

The employees of the CIA are certainly dedicated American citizens. The organization has a critical intelligence gathering function. The national security must be protected by the effective performance of that function. However, recent events would seem to clearly indicate that the limits of its role must be more clearly delineated and its activities more carefully supervised.

Wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping should be used only in the interest of national security. This should apply to subversion and organized crime, under court authorization with annual review by Congress.

#### THE GOVERNMENT'S POLICY IN VIETNAM—MEMORIAL

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I present a memorial signed by 259 students, teachers, and friends of the Daniel Webster High School, Tulsa, Okla., protesting against the policy of our Government in Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that the memorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Honorable RICHARD RUSSELL:

We, the undersigned students, teachers and friends of Daniel Webster High School, Tulsa, Oklahoma, do protest the policy of our government on the following counts:

1. The way in which our government agrees to a truce policy in which all interested parties do not have to abide by the rules. In the latest truce the Viet Cong were agreeable to the terms, but the North Viet forces were not.

2. We protest our involvement in future truce agreements unless a sincere desire for peace is evidenced on both sides.

3. We protest any stopping in the bombing of vital targets and would actually like to see more important targets hit.

4. Since the truce of January 1966, and the latest so-called truce were both used by the enemy to build up supplies and manpower, we would like to see a halt to these "farce" truces which only end in more Americans getting killed to get the job done.

#### THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST NATIONAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, today, February 23, 1967, marks the 50th anniversary of the signing of the first National Vocational Education Act by President Woodrow Wilson. Since 1917, public vocational education has been a cooperative effort between the Federal Government and the States, the Federal Government providing much of the financing and the States operating and controlling their own programs.

Today, only 10 percent of our work force is employed in occupations that require a baccalaureate or higher degree; another 7 percent are employed in jobs that require no formal education, the so-called unskilled occupations; and the remaining 83 percent are employed in jobs that require some type of vocational or technical education. These jobs range in skill level from simple to highly skilled and technical, many requiring 1 or 2 years of post-high-school occupational education.

As parents, we oftentimes equate success with a college degree, and for this reason we are not always objective in judging our children's abilities or their occupational outlook. We cannot deny, however, that the industrial and military supremacy that our Nation enjoys today is due to the high productivity of each member of our work force. In order to maintain this supremacy, we must realistically appraise our need for more and better trained workers in the years ahead. Mechanization, automation, and data processing have completely revolutionized the needs of the labor market, so much so, in fact, that almost every new job today requires not only more vocational education but also more highly specialized vocational education than ever before.

It is obvious, therefore, that we must provide some type of vocational or technical education for the majority of our students—that 83 percent—before they enter the labor force. In contrast to this large segment of our population that should be enrolled in vocational or technical education, nationwide, only 22 percent of the high school population is enrolled in vocational or technical education.

One of the newest innovations in teaching vocational education is the cooperative method in which students are enrolled in a full-time curriculum, yet split their day evenly between academic classes and part-time work in a local business establishment. More important than the wages students earn is the fact that this is a teaching-learning situation in their chosen career and is conducted under the supervision of their vocational teacher working cooperatively with the director of the local training station. This is a valuable learning activity for students and helps to prepare them for gainful employment upon completion of their formal education.

It is not easy to put a price tag on an educational program, but students enrolled in cooperative vocational programs last year in Arizona earned \$1,796,956, an amount almost equal to

the total Federal allotment for vocational education. Without exaggeration, the vocational-technical education program being conducted in Arizona is one of the most successful and economical nationwide, a fact largely due to the excellent leadership of Mr. J. R. Cullison, State director, and his dedicated staff.

Although one can justify the vocational programs on the basis of the occupational competency developed through these programs, I believe that some of the more enduring benefits derived from these programs are those developed through the youth organizations that are part of the regular vocational programs. Certainly, no one can deny the good citizenship and leadership training that our Future Farmers, our Future Homemakers, our DECA—distributive education—members, and more recently our VICA—vocational industrial—members gain from planning and participating in a youth organization that is meaningful and challenging to each of them because it is dedicated to promoting their occupational interest.

On the threshold of a new era in the history of vocational education, I commend too the work of the teachers and leaders as well as the students in vocational education and pledge my continued support to this very worthwhile segment of our educational program.

#### THE BOMBING OF NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, among the matters discussed by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., in his column of February 19 was one of great interest to us all—the bombing of North Vietnam.

I believe that the views of this well-respected, veteran journalist merit consideration. There is in them a logic and directness that I have found to be largely missing from the emotion-charged discussions of this issue.

Mr. Hearst observes the bombing for what it is—a military weapon. And he concludes that it must be pretty effective to cause Hanoi to demand its cessation before negotiations can begin.

If—as is popularly charged—America is deliberately raiding North Vietnamese cities, why are they still almost entirely intact?

And his main point: stopping bombing would relieve Ho Chi Minh of some of his main concern, and we are not there to help Ho Chi Minh.

I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore News American, Feb. 19, 1967]

U.S. BOMBING HURTS HANOI

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

The resumption of American bombing of North Vietnam, and the subsequent howls of anguish it evoked, is keeping this aspect of the Vietnam war firmly in place as the most controversial issue in the news.

For this reason alone, Defense Secretary Robert McNamara—often pretty controversial himself—has done practically everyone a favor by clearing the air regarding the bombing and by placing its results in correct perspective.